

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.GIRI

WEDNESDAY, THE 19TH DECEMBER 2007 / 28TH AGRAHAYANA 1929

WP(C).No. 37169 of 2007(Y)

PETITIONER:

J.LAL, AGED 59 YEARS
CLEANER, KERALA STATE COIR CORPORATION LTD
ALAPPUZHA, (RETD ON 31-08-2002) S/O. THE LATE JAMAL
MUBARAK MANZIL, NEAR MUHAMMED SCHOOL CIVIL STATION
WARD, ALAPPUZHA.

BY ADV. SRI.C.S.MANU
SRI.S.K.PREMRAJ
SRI.ANOOP JOSEPH
SRI.ANOOP.V.NAIR
SRI.ABHILASH AKBAR
SRI.T.B.SIVAPRASAD

RESPONDENTS:

1. KERALA STATE COIR CORPORATION
ALAPPUZHA, REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
2. MANAGING DIRECTOR
KERALA STATE COIR CORPORATION LTD
P.B.NO.191, ALAPPUZHA.

BY ADV. SRI.K.N.BALACHANDRAN KARTHA, SC, COIRCFT

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 19/12/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

V. GIRI, J.

W.P.(C).NO.37169 OF 2007-Y

Dated this the 19th day of December, 2007.

JUDGMENT

Petitioner, who was in the service of the 1st respondent, took voluntary retirement with effect from 31.8.2002. According to the petitioner, he was not disbursed the retirement benefits in accordance with the rules. Petitioner approached this Court in W.P.(C)No.33864/2005, which is stated to have been disposed of by directing the respondents to pay the admitted amounts within a time frame. The petitioner was paid an amount of Rs.8,820.15 alone after adjusting the balance amount due towards certain other liabilities noted against the petitioner. This is evidenced by Ext.P3.

2. Petitioner claims that by Ext.P2, pay scales of various categories of employees in the 1st respondent was revised with effect from 1.4.2002. He retired from service on 31.8.2002. The petitioner, therefore, claims that he is entitled to difference in wages. He also claims that the pay revision will have an impact on the VRS benefits and also the gratuity payable to him.

These claims are contained in Ext.P4, which is stated to have been submitted on 21.11.2007.

3. Though a copy of the writ petition has been served on the Standing Counsel for the 1st respondent, there was no appearance on 17.12.2007 nor today, when the matter was taken. In the circumstances, I heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

After considering the contentions of the petitioner and the averments in the writ petition as well as Ext.P4, the writ petition is disposed of directing the 2nd respondent to look into Ext.P4 and pass appropriate orders taking note of the fact that the pay scales were revised on 1.4.2002 as per Ext.P2. If the petitioner's claims are found to be acceptable, then, necessary steps may be taken to disburse the amounts due to the petitioner. Needful shall be done within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. The petitioner shall produce a copy of this judgment before the 2nd respondent for compliance.

V. GIRI, JUDGE.

cl

